

REMARKS

In the Office action, claims 1-7 were rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) by US 5,085,181 Feuling. Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 recites:

a pressure oil lubrication system ... and the improvement comprising: a valve actuating system including hydraulic actuators operable to actuate the valves; and a pressure oil hydraulic system separate from the lubrication system and operative to selectively supply pressure hydraulic oil to the hydraulic actuators to actuate the valves in a predetermined manner.

It is submitted that Feuling does not disclose “a pressure oil hydraulic system separate from the lubrication system” as claim 1 requires. The various systems of Feuling clearly draw oil from a common sump and utilize the same engine oil in all portions of the system. Thus, the various portions of Feuling’s system are not separate systems because they have only a single sump containing oil for all parts of the system. Further, his system cannot supply “pressure hydraulic oil” that differs from the engine lubricating oil required for use in his system. Thus, the use of typical hydraulic oil formulations is foreclosed.

Also, the Feuling system uses conventional valve lifters which, when normally operated, use engine oil only to adjust the valve lash and not to change the valve lift, the oil acting only as a trapped volume which passes the valve lift force from the engine cam to the valve through the mechanical mechanism of the valve lifter. Referring to this device as a hydraulic actuator seems to be a misapplication of the term.

Since Feuling neither teaches nor suggests the system recited in claim 1, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn and its allowance is requested.

Dependent claims 2-7 are amended in substance to refer to a new claim 8, which adds to original claim 1, separate oil sumps and oil pumps. Allowance is requested.

A new claim 9 is added, dependent on claim 8, which recites the ability to use differing oil formulations in the claimed engine system and the avoidance of cross contamination of the separate oil systems.

In summary, claims 1-9 now in the application clearly distinguish from the subject matter taught by Feuling. Allowance of the claims is accordingly requested.

This amendment is believed to be fully responsive to the issues raised in the Office Action and to place this case in condition for allowance. Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert J Outland, Attorney
Reg. No. 22,197
(313) 885-1500